

Lorentz Invariance And Unitarity Problem in Non-Commutative Field Theory

Katsusada MORITA,¹ Yoshitaka OKUMURA² and Eizou UMEZAWA³

¹*Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan*

²*Department of Natural Sciences, Chubu University, Kasugai 487-0027, Japan*

³*School of Health Sciences, Fujita Health University, Toyoake 470-1192, Japan*

Abstract

It is shown that the one-loop two-point amplitude in *Lorentz-invariant* non-commutative (NC) ϕ^3 theory is finite after subtraction in the commutative limit and satisfies the usual cutting rule, thereby eliminating the unitarity problem in Lorentz-non-invariant NC field theory in the approximation considered.

§1. Introduction

In the past few years many encouraging works have been done on the non-commutative quantum field theory (NCQFT, simply called QFT_* in this paper), that is, quantum field theory (QFT) based on the assumption that the space-time, say, at the Planck scale would become point-less with non-commuting coordinates where gravity plays an essential role and the usual notion of the space-time structure may become ineffective. The idea of non-commuting coordinates dates back to Snyder¹⁾ and Yang²⁾ in 1947 before the renormalization theory. But the idea seems to have more profound meaning when gravity (black hole) and quantum mechanics (uncertainty relation) is to be reconciled.³⁾ It is a matter of course that recent upsurge of QFT_* mainly arises from a possible connection of non-commutative geometry with string theory as refined by Seiberg and Witten.⁴⁾

QFT_* is a field theory on the non-commutative space-time in which the space-time coordinates represented by hermitian operators $\hat{x}^\mu$ no longer commute:

$$[\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu}, \quad \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (1.1)$$

Here $(\theta^{\mu\nu})$ is a real antisymmetric constant matrix. We call (1.1) the θ -algebra. Any field in QFT_* is an operator-valued function, $\hat{\varphi}(\hat{x})$. Associated with it is the Weyl symbol $\varphi(x)$

$$\hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}) = \int d^4k \tilde{\varphi}(k) e^{ik\hat{x}} \longleftrightarrow \varphi(x) = \int d^4k \tilde{\varphi}(k) e^{ikx}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $k\hat{x} \equiv k_\mu \hat{x}^\mu$. The operator product $\hat{\varphi}_1(\hat{x})\hat{\varphi}_2(\hat{x})$ then corresponds to the Moyal $*$ -product of the Weyl symbols

$$\hat{\varphi}_1(\hat{x})\hat{\varphi}_2(\hat{x}) \longleftrightarrow \varphi_1(x) * \varphi_2(x) \equiv \varphi_1(x) e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu} \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \overrightarrow{\partial}_\nu} \varphi_2(x). \quad (1.3)$$

The Weyl-Moyal correspondence implies that QFT_* is a nonlocal field theory defined on the ordinary space-time with the point-wise multiplication of field variables being replaced by the $*$ -product. Thus the action defining QFT_* is given by

$$S = \text{tr}[\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}), \partial_\mu \hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}))] = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}(\varphi(x), \partial_\mu \varphi(x))_*, \quad (1.4)$$

where we have normalized $\text{tr} e^{ik\hat{x}} = (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(k)$ and the subscript of the Lagrangian indicates that the $*$ -product should be taken for all products of the field variables.

This nonlocality makes the theory difficult to manage in comparison with QFT although it may resolve at least partially the divergence problem.^{5), 6)} The main source of the difficulty is due to the so-called IR/UV mixing⁷⁾: the nonplanar Feynman diagram is made UV finite, but instead shows IR

singularity when the regularization parameter is removed. Another source of the difficulty concerns with a possible breakdown⁸⁾ of the familiar theorems established in QFT. One notable example is the unitarity violation.⁹⁾ An approach based on the Hamiltonian formalism to avoid the unitarity problem was proposed in Ref. 10). It was elaborated by Rim and Yee.¹¹⁾ Chu et al.¹²⁾ discussed the interplay between the IR/UV mixing and the unitarity problem.

Focusing on the unitarity problem, the present paper proposes another approach. It grows from our careful repeating of the calculation by Gomis and Mehen⁹⁾ of the one-loop amplitude for the two-point function in the NC ϕ^3 (ϕ^{*3}) model. We found that, if the Feynman amplitude is Lorentz-invariant, their proof of the unitarity relation for the time-like external momentum suggests non-appearance of the imaginary part in the space-like region on the contrary to what claimed by them, thereby eliminating the unitarity problem in the approximation under consideration.

The next problem is how to make the NC amplitude Lorentz-invariant. In other words, it is necessary to construct a Lorentz-invariant NC field theory. Snyder¹⁾ was the first who showed that Lorentz invariance allows in addition to the continuum space-time a NC space-time in which a single fundamental length is naturally introduced. Doplicher, Fredenhagen and Roberts (DFR)³⁾ also proposed a Lorentz-invariant NC field theory whose Feynman rules are formulated by Filk.⁵⁾ The DFR quantum space³⁾ is based on the algebra

$$[\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu] = i\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}, \hat{x}^\nu] = 0 = [\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}, \hat{\theta}^{\rho\sigma}], \quad \mu, \nu, \rho, \sigma = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (1.5)$$

where $\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}$ is an antisymmetric second-rank tensor operator. It was rediscovered by Carlson, Carone and Zobin¹³⁾ who introduced the Lorentz-invariant action described below. We have called (1.5) the DFR algebra in Refs. 14) and 15). As shown in Ref. 15) the θ -algebra (1.1) holds true as a ‘weak’ relation, where $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is an eigenvalue of the operator $\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}$. Thus $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is an antisymmetric second-rank tensor. This permits us to define a fundamental length a through¹⁴⁾

$$\theta^{\mu\nu} = a^2 \bar{\theta}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (1.6)$$

Based on this algebra the connections (1.2) and (1.3) are maintained by a slight modification. Namely, the Weyl symbol now depends on the eigenvalue $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ of the operator $\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}$, written as $\varphi(x, \theta)$, and one needs an integration over the extra 6-dimensional variable $\theta^{\mu\nu}$. The new correspondence is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}) &= \int d^4k d^6\sigma \tilde{\varphi}(k, \sigma) e^{ik\hat{x} + i\sigma\hat{\theta}} \longleftrightarrow \varphi(x, \theta) = \int d^4k d^6\sigma \tilde{\varphi}(k, \sigma) e^{ikx + i\sigma\theta} \\ \hat{\varphi}_1(\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}) \hat{\varphi}_2(\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}) &\longleftrightarrow \varphi_1(x, \theta) * \varphi_2(x, \theta) \equiv \varphi_1(x, \theta) e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu} \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \overrightarrow{\partial}_\nu} \varphi_2(x, \theta), \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

where $\sigma\hat{\theta} = \sigma_{\mu\nu}\hat{\theta}^{\mu\nu}$. The action (1.4) is then replaced with

$$\hat{S} = \text{tr}[\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}), \partial_\mu \hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}))] = \int d^4x d^6\theta W(\theta) \mathcal{L}(\varphi(x, \theta), \partial_\mu \varphi(x, \theta))_*. \quad (1.8)$$

This form of the Lorentz-invariant QFT_{*} action with a normalized weight function $W(\theta)$ being Lorentz-invariant was first obtained by Carlson, Carone and Zobin,¹³⁾ applied to construct Lorentz-invariant NCQED¹⁴⁾ and further studied in Ref.15).

In the framework of the Lorentz-invariant NC field theory we reinvestigated the unitarity problem. Taking $D = 4$ ϕ^{*3} theory in the one-loop approximation for the self-energy diagram, we carefully repeat in the next section Gomis-Mehen's calculation and found that the unitarity relation even for time-like momentum is frame-dependent in their theory. Facing this problem we then ask ourselves what happens on the unitarity problem if we employ the Lorentz-invariant NC field theory with the action (1.8). We obtain in the section 3 an interesting result that the one-loop amplitude for the self-energy diagram in the Lorentz-invariant ϕ^{*3} theory is finite after subtraction in the commutative limit and unitary. We give some remarks in the last section.

§2. A comment on the paper by Gomis and Mehen

For our purpose, it is enough to consider one of the models discussed in Ref. 9), namely, $D = 4$ ϕ^{*3} theory based on (1.1). The action is given by

$$S = \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi(x) * \partial^\mu \phi(x) - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi(x) * \phi(x) - \frac{\lambda}{3!} \phi(x) * \phi(x) * \phi(x) \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where $\phi(x)$ is a scalar field, m is the mass parameter and λ is the coupling constant. The amplitude M_{ab} for the transition $a \rightarrow b$ must satisfy the unitarity relation,

$$2\text{Im } M_{ab} = \sum_n M_{an} M_{bn}^*, \quad (2.2)$$

provided $M_{ab} = M_{ba}$ which is true in the following. The sum is to be taken over all possible intermediate states.

In this section, following Gomis and Mehen,⁹⁾ we confine ourselves to check the unitarity relation to the order $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$. The one-loop amplitude for the self-energy diagram is given by

$$M = -i \frac{\lambda^2}{4} \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1 + \cos(p \wedge q)}{((p - q)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon)(q^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon)}, \quad (2.3)$$

where p is the external momentum, and $p \wedge q = p_\mu \theta^{\mu\nu} q_\nu$. Using Feynman parameter and Schwinger representation we write it as a convergent integral

$$M = \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^\infty d\alpha \alpha^{-1} \left(e^{-\alpha(-x(1-x)p^2 + m^2 - i\epsilon)} + e^{-\alpha(-x(1-x)p^2 + m^2 - i\epsilon) - \frac{p \circ p}{4\alpha}} \right) e^{-\frac{1}{4\alpha\Lambda^2}}, \quad (2.4)$$

where we define

$$p \circ p \equiv p^\mu \theta_{\mu\nu}^2 p^\nu = (p^0 \theta_{0i})^2 - (p^i \theta_{i0})^2 - 2p^0 \theta_{0i} \theta_{ij} p^j + (p_i \theta^{ij})^2, \quad (2.5)$$

and the last factor $e^{-\frac{1}{4\alpha\Lambda^2}}$ is the regularization one except for which (2.4) is identical to (the analytical continuation of) Eq.(2.8) in Ref. 9). *) It is important to remember that M depends on $p \circ p$ as well as p^2 , $M = M(p^2, p \circ p)$, where the regularization dependence is not displayed. If $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is a tensor, $p \circ p$ is Lorentz-invariant. This is not the case if $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is a constant matrix as usually assumed. The Lorentz violation in the conventional NC field theory manifests itself in the fact that $p \circ p$ is *not* Lorentz-invariant for constant $\theta^{\mu\nu}$, neither is the amplitude M .

It is straightforward to obtain from (2.4)

$$M = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx [K_0(\sqrt{(-x(1-x)p^2 + m^2)/\Lambda^2}) + K_0(\sqrt{(p \circ p + 1/\Lambda^2)(-x(1-x)p^2 + m^2)})], \quad (2.6)$$

where K_0 is the modified Bessel function. This gives the imaginary part for $p^2 > 4m^2$

$$\text{Im } M = \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi} \int_{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}^{\frac{1+\gamma}{2}} dx [J_0(\sqrt{(p^2 x(1-x) - m^2)/\Lambda^2}) + J_0(\sqrt{(p \circ p + 1/\Lambda^2)(p^2 x(1-x) - m^2)})], \quad (2.7)$$

where $\gamma = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{p^2}}$, J_0 is the Bessel function (put $n = 0$ in (3.26)). Since the imaginary part is regularization-independent, we let $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty$ to recover Gomis-Mehen's result ⁹⁾

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } M &= \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi} \gamma + \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi} \int_{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}^{\frac{1+\gamma}{2}} dx J_0(\sqrt{p \circ p (p^2 x(1-x) - m^2)}) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi} \gamma + \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi} \frac{\sin(\gamma \sqrt{p^2 p \circ p}/2)}{\sqrt{p^2 p \circ p}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

*) We have evaluated the amplitude (2.3) via Wick rotation and then analytically continued á la Gomis and Mehen. The convergence of the integral (2.4) limits $p^2 < 4m^2$ and $p \circ p + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} > 0$.

where we have assumed $p \circ p > 0$. Recall that this imaginary part originates from the divergence at $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ of the α -integral in (2.4) for $p^2 > 4m^2$.

Let us now go on to the evaluation of the unitarity sum (2.2) derived from the cutting rule in the same approximation. Gomis and Mehen⁹⁾ presented the following result for $p^2 > 4m^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum |M|^2 &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^2} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{2\omega_k} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{q}}{2\omega_q} \delta^4(p - q - k) \frac{1 + \cos(p \wedge k)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{4 \cdot 32\pi^2} \gamma \int d\Omega [1 + \cos(p \wedge k)] = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi} \gamma + \frac{\lambda^2}{16\pi} \frac{\sin(\gamma \sqrt{p^2 p \circ p/2})}{\sqrt{p^2 p \circ p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Note that there are two on-shell particles in the intermediate state, their momenta being labelled by k and $q = p - k$. This result shows that the unitarity relation (2.2) for $a = b$ being the one-particle state with $p^2 > 4m^2$ for which $p \circ p > 0$ ^{*}) is satisfied to order $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$. For space-like momentum for which $p \circ p$ can become negative, we are unable to let $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty$ keeping the positivity of $p \circ p + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2}$. This signals the breakdown of the unitarity relation, for the unitarity sum identically vanishes for space-like momentum and the imaginary part of (2.6) when $p \circ p + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2}$ is negative is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } M &= \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi} \int_0^1 dx J_0 \left(\sqrt{|p \circ p + 1/\Lambda^2| (-x(1-x)p^2 + m^2)} \right) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi} \int_0^1 dx J_0 \left(\sqrt{|p \circ p| (-x(1-x)p^2 + m^2)} \right), \quad (p^2 < 0), \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where we take the limit $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty$. This imaginary part comes from the divergence of the α -integral at $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ (not ∞) in the second term in (2.4) due to the presence of the extra term $-\frac{p \circ p}{4\alpha}$ in the exponential. This is the critical observation by Gomis and Mehen.⁹⁾ The next problem we focus on in this section is to carefully compute the integral appearing in (2.9),

$$I = \int d\Omega \cos(p \wedge k). \quad (2.11)$$

If $p \circ p$ is not Lorentz scalar, its value differs in general in different Lorentz frames. If, instead, $p \circ p$ is Lorentz scalar, its value in a particular Lorentz frame is the same for all Lorentz frames. In what follows we compute the integral (2.11) in two different Lorentz frames.

For p time-like we go over to the rest frame, $p^0 \neq 0, \mathbf{p} = 0$ so that $p \circ p = (p^0 \theta_{0i})^2 > 0$. In the rest frame we have

$$p \wedge k = p_0 \theta^{0i} k_i = \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \mathbf{k} = |\tilde{\mathbf{p}}| |\mathbf{k}| \cos \theta, \quad (2.12)$$

^{*}) This is so because (2.5) implies $p \circ p = (p^0 \theta_{0i})^2$ in the rest frame, $p^0 \neq 0, \mathbf{p} = 0$, for time-like case. If $p \circ p$ is not Lorentz scalar, it may take different numerical values in different Lorentz frames, but the unitarity sum should be taken in the same Lorentz frame where the imaginary part is evaluated.

where θ is the angle between $\mathbf{k}$ and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = (\tilde{p}_1 = \theta^{01}p_0, \tilde{p}_2 = \theta^{02}p_0, \tilde{p}_3 = \theta^{03}p_0) \quad (2.13)$$

It follows from (2.5) that

$$p \circ p = |\tilde{\mathbf{p}}|^2 \quad (2.14)$$

in the rest frame. Consequently, we have

$$p \wedge k = \sqrt{p \circ p} |\mathbf{k}_{\text{cm}}| \cos \theta \quad (2.15)$$

where we have used the fact that $|\mathbf{k}|$ in the rest frame is given by the invariant center of mass momentum $|\mathbf{k}_{\text{cm}}| = \sqrt{\frac{p^2}{4} - m^2}$. Thus we arrive at the result

$$I = 2\pi \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin \theta \cos(\sqrt{p \circ p} |\mathbf{k}_{\text{cm}}| \cos \theta) = 4\pi \frac{\sin(\sqrt{p \circ p} |\mathbf{k}_{\text{cm}}|)}{\sqrt{p \circ p} |\mathbf{k}_{\text{cm}}|}, \quad (2.16)$$

hence obtaining (2.9). Note that we have only checked the unitarity relation in a particular Lorentz frame, the rest frame for time-like p . The same value of $p \circ p$ as given by (2.14) has to be substituted into the imaginary part, (2.8).

There exists another Lorentz frame in which $\theta^{0i} = 0$, where the integral I is easily calculated. ^{*)} In this frame, we have $p \circ p = (p_i \theta^{ij})^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge k &= p_i \theta^{ij} k_j = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}' \cdot \mathbf{k} = |\tilde{\mathbf{p}}'| |\mathbf{k}| \cos \theta' = \sqrt{p \circ p} |\mathbf{k}| \cos \theta' \\ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}' &= (\tilde{p}'_1 = \theta^{j1} p_j, \tilde{p}'_2 = \theta^{j2} p_j, \tilde{p}'_3 = \theta^{j3} p_j) \\ p \circ p &= |\tilde{\mathbf{p}}'|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Thus (2.16) is regained if we put $|\mathbf{k}| = |\mathbf{k}_{\text{cm}}|$. It should be remarked, however, that, although we used the same notation $p \circ p$ in (2.15) and (2.17), they are defined in a different way in the two cases so that they may be numerically different. In this sense the unitarity relation in NC field theory is frame-dependent. In order to check it we should evaluate both sides of the unitarity relation in the same Lorentz frame, but the resulting relation holds true separately in the Lorentz frames employed.

If the amplitude (2.3) is considered to be Lorentz-invariant, the situation is drastically changed. In such a case, the unitarity relation is also Lorentz-invariant, and it should be true in any Lorentz

^{*)} This never means that the unitarity sum leads to a non-trivial result also in this case.

frames if it is proved in a particular Lorentz frame. However, the Lorentz frames $\theta^{0i} = 0$ and $\theta^{ij} = 0$ are not connected by any Lorentz transformations just like time-like p is never Lorentz-transformed into space-like p . ^{*)} If the Lorentz frame $\theta^{0i} = 0$ is connected with the rest frame by Lorentz transformations, both $|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}|^2$ and $|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}'|^2$ should be the same numerically. If, on the other hand, the Lorentz frame $\theta^{ij} = 0$ is connected with the rest frame by Lorentz transformations, both $|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}|^2$ and $(p^0\theta_{0i})^2 - (p^i\theta_{i0})^2$ ^{**)} should be the same numerically. In any case, it is enough to integrate (2.12) in the rest frame by assuming that $p \circ p$ is Lorentz scalar.

In the next section we argue that all Lorentz frames for time-like p have negative value of ζ ,

$$\zeta = \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu}\theta_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.18)$$

while any Lorentz frames for space-like p have positive value of ζ . There exists a Lorentz frame $\theta^{ij} = 0$ for $\zeta < 0$ and for $\zeta > 0$ we can choose a Lorentz frame with $\theta^{0i} = 0$. Hence, $p \circ p = (p^0\theta_{0i})^2$ for time-like p in the rest frame, while $p \circ p = (p_i\theta^{ij})^2$ for space-like p in the Lorentz frame with $\theta^{0i} = 0$. Consequently, $p \circ p$ is positive definite for both time-like and space-like momenta. That is, Lorentz invariance cures the unitarity problem. The imaginary part (2.10) completely disappears from the scene because $p \circ p + 1/\Lambda^2$ is positive even for space-like p .

For this reason we expect that Lorentz invariance is a powerful guiding principle also in NC field theory. However, it is impossible to regard $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ in (1.1) as an antisymmetric c -number tensor if $\hat{x}^\mu$ transforms as a 4-vector. ¹⁵⁾ What this means is that we can not regard the amplitude (2.3) as being Lorentz-invariant. Consequently, we must look for another NC algebra which naturally provides us with a tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$, thus enabling us to prove our conjecture alluded to above with a bit certainty, and preserves Lorentz invariance of the theory. Such a Lorentz-invariant NC field theory connected with the θ -algebra was formulated by Carlson, Carone and Zobin ¹³⁾ based on the DFR algebra (1.5). In the next section we prove the absence of the unitarity problem at one-loop in the Lorentz-invariant ϕ^{*3} theory.

§3. Lorentz invariance and unitarity problem in ϕ^{*3} theory

Let us now consider the same model based on the DFR algebra (1.5). The Lorentz-invariant action is given by

$$\hat{S} = \int d^6\theta W(\theta) \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi(x) * \partial^\mu \phi(x) - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi(x) * \phi(x) - \frac{\lambda}{3!} \phi(x) * \phi(x) * \phi(x) \right], \quad (3.1)$$

^{*)} They are only connected through analytic continuation.

^{**)} This is always positive for time-like p because, by Schwarz inequality, $(p^0\theta_{0i})^2 - (p^i\theta_{i0})^2 \geq (p^0\theta_{0i})^2 - (p^i)^2(\theta_{i0})^2 = p^2(\theta_{i0})^2 > 0$.

where the scalar field $\phi(x)$ is assumed to be independent of θ . Using (1.6) we put

$$W(\theta) = a^{-12} w(\bar{\theta}). \quad (3.2)$$

We may then rewrite (3.1) as

$$\hat{S} = \int d^6 \bar{\theta} w(\bar{\theta}) \int d^4 x \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi(x) * \partial^\mu \phi(x) - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi(x) * \phi(x) - \frac{\lambda}{3!} \phi(x) * \phi(x) * \phi(x) \right]. \quad (3.3)$$

The vertex in the Feynman diagram is associated with $i\lambda$ times the factor

$$V(k_1, k_2) = \int d^6 \bar{\theta} w(\bar{\theta}) \cos \frac{k_1 \wedge k_2}{2}, \quad (3.4)$$

where k_1 and k_2 are the momenta flowing into the vertex. In the previous section we did not encounter the $\bar{\theta}$ -integration.

Using the above Feynman rule we obtain the one-loop amplitude for the self-energy diagram

$$\mathcal{M} = -i \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{V^2(p, q)}{((p - q)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon)(q^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon)}. \quad (3.5)$$

In order to evaluate this integral we first determine the vertex factor $V(p, q)$. As a model we take the one discussed in Ref. 14). Using the formulae (4. 14) in Ref. 14) we find

$$\begin{aligned} V(p, q) &= \int d^6 \bar{\theta} w(\bar{\theta}) \left[1 - \frac{1}{2!} \left(\frac{p \wedge q}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4!} \left(\frac{p \wedge q}{2} \right)^4 - + \dots \right] \\ &= 1 - \frac{a^4}{2!4} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle}{12} [q^2 p^2 - (p \cdot q)^2] + \frac{a^8}{4!4^2} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^4 \rangle}{64} [q^2 p^2 - (p \cdot q)^2]^2 - + \dots \\ &= e^{-\frac{a^4}{4} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle}{24} [q^2 p^2 - (p \cdot q)^2]}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where the invariant moments are defined by

$$\langle \bar{\theta}^{2n} \rangle = \int d^6 \bar{\theta} w(\bar{\theta}) (\bar{\theta}^{\mu\nu} \bar{\theta}_{\mu\nu})^n, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (3.7)$$

and we exponentiated the infinite sum by assuming the relations

$$\langle \bar{\theta}^4 \rangle = \frac{4}{3} (\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle)^2 \quad (3.8)$$

and so on. These relations are obtained for Gaussian $w(\bar{\theta})$.^{14), 15)}

For time-like p we choose the rest frame, $p_0 \neq 0, \mathbf{p} = 0$ in which

$$V(p, q) = e^{\frac{a^4}{4} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle}{24} p_0^2 q^2} \equiv J. \quad (3.9)$$

To ensure the convergence of the integral (3.5) we have to assume that

$$\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle < 0 \quad \text{for time-like } p. \quad (3.10)$$

We then compute the integral (3.5) by first enclosing the q_0 -integration path from $-\infty$ to ∞ with the upper large semi-circle in the q_0 -plane in a counterclockwise way. This picks up two poles at $q_0 = -\omega_{\mathbf{q}} + i\epsilon$ and at $q_0 = p_0 - \omega_{\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q}} + i\epsilon = p_0 - \omega_{\mathbf{q}} + i\epsilon$, where $\omega_{\mathbf{q}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{q}^2 + m^2}$. The result turns out to be

$$\mathcal{M} = -\frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{q} \frac{J^2}{(2\omega_{\mathbf{q}})^2} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 - 2\omega_{\mathbf{q}} + i\epsilon} - \frac{1}{p_0 + 2\omega_{\mathbf{q}} + i\epsilon} \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

Thanks to the assumption (3.10) this integral is convergent. For $p_0 > 0$ this gives the imaginary part

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \mathcal{M} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{q} \frac{J^2}{(2\omega_{\mathbf{q}})^2} \pi \delta(p_0 - 2\omega_{\mathbf{q}}) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{8\pi} \frac{|\mathbf{q}| J^2}{2p_0} = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi} \gamma e^{\frac{a^4}{2} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle}{24} (p^2)^2 (\frac{\gamma}{2})^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where γ is the same as in (2.7). The final result is an invariant one valid for $p^2 > 4m^2$. This is nothing but half the unitarity sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum |\mathcal{M}|^2 &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2(2\pi)^2} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{q}}{2\omega_{\mathbf{q}}} \delta^4(p - q - k) J^2 \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{16\pi} \gamma e^{\frac{a^4}{2} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle}{24} (p^2)^2 (\frac{\gamma}{2})^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

That is, we proved the unitarity relation

$$2\text{Im } \mathcal{M} = \sum |\mathcal{M}|^2, \quad (3.14)$$

for the two-point function in the lowest-order approximation.

Now that we have checked the unitarity relation to order $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$ in a Lorentz-invariant way, we proceed to prove that the Lorentz-invariant amplitude (3.5) do not develop the imaginary part for space-like p . For space-like p we choose the Euclidean momenta

$$\begin{aligned} p^0 &\rightarrow ip_E^4, & \mathbf{p} &\rightarrow \mathbf{p}_E, & p^2 &\rightarrow -p_E^2, \\ q^0 &\rightarrow iq_E^4, & \mathbf{q} &\rightarrow \mathbf{q}_E, & q^2 &\rightarrow -q_E^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where the Euclidean momenta p_E and q_E are real. In addition the non-commutativity parameter is also made Euclidean,

$$\theta^{0i} \rightarrow -i\theta_E^{4i}, \quad \theta^{ij} \rightarrow \theta_E^{ij} \quad (3.16)$$

so that

$$p \wedge q = p_E \wedge_E q_E \equiv \sum_{\mu, \nu=1,2,3,4} (p_E)_\mu \theta_E^{\mu\nu} (q_E)_\nu. \quad (3.17)$$

The vertex factor $V(p, q)$ becomes the *invariant damping factor*¹⁴⁾

$$V(p_E, q_E) = e^{-\frac{a^4}{4} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}_E^2 \rangle}{24} [q_E^2 p_E^2 - (p_E \cdot q_E)^2]}, \quad (3.18)$$

since

$$\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \bar{\theta}_E^2 \rangle > 0 \quad \text{for space-like } p. \quad (3.19)$$

The amplitude (3.5) becomes for space-like p

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^4} \int_0^1 dx \int d^4 q_E \frac{V^2(p_E, q_E)}{(q_E^2 + \mu_E^2)^2}, \quad (3.20)$$

where we put $\mu_E^2 = p_E^2 x(1-x) + m^2$. Using Schwinger representation we rewrite this expression as

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^4} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^\infty d\alpha \alpha \int d^4 q_E e^{-\alpha(q_E^2 + \mu_E^2) - A_E [q_E^2 p_E^2 - (p_E \cdot q_E)^2]}, \quad (3.21)$$

with $A_E = \frac{a^4}{2} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}_E^2 \rangle}{24} > 0$. The q_E -integration is easily done in the frame $p_E^1 = p_E^2 = 0$ to obtain an invariant result

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^\infty d\alpha \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha} + A_E p_E^2)^3} e^{-\alpha \mu_E^2}. \quad (3.22)$$

If we go back to the Minkowski space, we have

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^\infty d\alpha \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - A p^2)^3} e^{-\alpha \mu^2}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $A = \frac{a^4}{2} \frac{\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle}{24}$ is positive for space-like p since it was positive in the Euclidean metric ^{*)} and $\mu^2 = -p^2 x(1-x) + m^2$ which is $\geq m^2$ for space-like p . There are two facts to be noted. First,

^{*)} Although ζ of (2.18) is indefinite in the Lorentz metric, A remains positive in the Minkowski space for space-like p . This is understood by remarking that $p_E^2 > 0$ in the Euclidean metric goes over to $-p^2 > 0$ in the Lorentz metric, while space-like p is always space-like in any Lorentz frames. The analytic continuation, say, $p^2 \rightarrow e^{it} p^2$ and $\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle \rightarrow e^{-it} \langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle$ with $t = 0 \rightarrow \pi$ (or $-\pi$) converts space-like p into time-like p accompanied with the sign change of $\langle \bar{\theta}^2 \rangle$. It is so chosen that the function $(\sqrt{\alpha} - A p^2)^3$ is single-valued.

since $-Ap^2 > 0$ for space-like p , the amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ has no imaginary part in that region. This is due to the fact that the imaginary part for space-like p , if exist, comes from a possible divergence at $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ of the α -integral in (3.23), which, in fact, converges for space-like p , $-Ap^2 > 0$. In other words, there is no unitarity problem in the one-loop level for 1-1 transition in the Lorentz-invariant ϕ^{*3} model. Second, the amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ includes both planar and nonplanar diagrams and the integral (3.23) is finite as far as $-Ap^2 = -\frac{a^4 \langle \theta^2 \rangle}{24} p^2 > 0$. A possible divergence at $p^2 \rightarrow 0$ is connected with the log divergence in the commutative limit. Namely, the IR limit $p^2 \rightarrow 0$ is indistinguishable from the commutative limit $a \rightarrow 0$, where we should recover the well-known log divergence which is subtracted off by renormalization. This is the correspondence principle that QFT_{*} should satisfy. Although we are far from formulating it in a quantitative way, we may define the regularized amplitude by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{reg}}(p^2) = \mathcal{M}(p^2) - \mathcal{M}(0) = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^\infty d\alpha \left[\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - Ap^2)^3} e^{-\alpha\mu^2} - \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha})^3} e^{-\alpha m^2} \right]. \quad (3.24)$$

The integrand in (3.24) at $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ when $a = 0$ behaves like $\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha})^3} [e^{\alpha p^2 x(1-x)} - 1] e^{-\alpha m^2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha} [\alpha p^2 x(1-x)] e^{-\alpha m^2}$ which renders the integral (3.24) convergent at $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

It would be interesting to directly check the unitarity relation from (3.23). To this purpose we need to remember (3.10) so that $-Ap^2$ is also positive for time-like p . That is, we require that A changes sign if p^2 is analytically continued from negative to positive values to make the function $(\sqrt{\alpha} - Ap^2)^3$ single-valued. If otherwise, the calculation leading to (3.12) will not be justified. The resulting imaginary part stems from the divergence of the integral (3.23) at $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we expand the factor $\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - Ap^2)^3}$ with respect to $-Ap^2$, which introduces additional divergences at $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. To avoid these new divergences we multiply the integrand of (3.23) through the regularization factor $e^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\Lambda^2}}$. Consequently, we must evaluate the integral for $0 < p^2 < 4m^2$ where $\mu^2 > 0$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^\infty d\alpha \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - Ap^2)^3} e^{-\alpha\mu^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha\Lambda^2}} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{-\frac{3}{2}}{n} (-Ap^2)^n \int_0^\infty \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha^{n+1}} e^{-\alpha\mu^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha\Lambda^2}} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{-\frac{3}{2}}{n} (-Ap^2)^n 2 \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^2 \mu^2} \right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} K_{-n}(2\sqrt{\mu^2/\Lambda^2}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Since the imaginary part of the modified Bessel function with the argument $\mu^2 = e^{-i\pi} |\mu^2|$ is given by

$$\text{Im} \left[2 \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^2 |\mu^2|} \right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{-n\pi i/2} K_{-n}(2e^{-i\pi/2} \sqrt{|\mu^2|/\Lambda^2}) \right] = \pi \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^2 |\mu^2|} \right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} J_n(2\sqrt{|\mu^2|/\Lambda^2}) \quad (3.26)$$

and the imaginary part for $p^2 > 4m^2$ is independent of the regularization parameter Λ^2 , we let $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty$ with $J_n(x) \rightarrow (\frac{x}{2})^n \frac{1}{n!}$ at $x \rightarrow 0$ to obtain for $p^2 > 4m^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \mathcal{M} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \int_{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}^{\frac{1+\gamma}{2}} dx \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{-\frac{3}{2}}{n} (-Ap^2)^n \pi \frac{|\mu^2|^n}{n!} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi} \gamma \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (A(p^2)^2)^n \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right)^n = \frac{\lambda^2}{32\pi} \gamma e^{A(p^2)^2 (\frac{\gamma}{2})^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

This is identical with the previous result (3.12).

§4. Remarks

Unitarity originates from the probability interpretation of quantum mechanics and, hence, is one of the indispensable elements in any theory subject to quantum mechanical interpretation. It is formulated as an asymptotic completeness in QFT. The asymptotic states are classified according to the unitary irreducible representations of the Poincaré group which must be the symmetry group of the underlying space-time. The quantum space³⁾ based on the DFR algebra enjoys the Poincaré symmetry. However, the symmetry group of the θ -algebra is smaller than the Poincaré group. In the canonical form of the non-commutativity parameter the θ -algebra has⁸⁾ the symmetry $O(1,1) \times SO(2) \ltimes T_4$, where $\ltimes$ denotes the semi-direct product. This implies, for instance, that the tachyonic states to be excluded from the asymptotic states by the spectral condition in QFT may be classified into ‘massive’ states according to the symmetry group $O(1,1) \times SO(2) \ltimes T_4$, which appear in the intermediate states in a closure relation.⁸⁾ These unsatisfactory aspects are expected to disappear if we ‘relativitize’ the θ -algebra in favor of the DFR algebra.

Our proof of the absence of the unitarity problem in the Lorentz-invariant NC field theory was made in the lowest-order approximation in a simplest unrealistic model. Nonetheless, we expect that unitarity is valid in more general circumstance.

We also found that the amplitude (3.23) is finite as far as $-Ap^2 > 0$. The subtraction is made by noting that the IR limit $p^2 \rightarrow 0$ can not be distinguished from the commutative limit $a \rightarrow 0$ where we should recover the well-known log divergence if QFT_{*} satisfies the correspondence principle. *) The problem of quantifying the correspondence principle is, however, left over.

*) Long wave length ‘sees’ the space-time in a coarse way, that is, in the IR limit, the space-time non-commutativity loses its meaning. An interpretation along this direction was put forward in Ref. 14).

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to H. Kase for useful discussions and careful reading of the manuscript.

References

- 1) H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **71** (1947), 38.
- 2) C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **72** (1947), 874.
- 3) S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen and J. E. Roberts, Phys. Lett. **B 331** (1994), 39; Commun. Math. Phys. **172** (1995), 187.
- 4) N. Seiberg and E. Witten, ‘String Theory and Noncommutative Geometry’, J. High Energy Phys. **09** (1999), 032.(hep-th/9908142(1999))
- 5) T. Filk, Phys. Lett. **B 376** (1996), 53.
- 6) M. Chaichian, A. Demichev and P. Prešnajder, ‘Quantum Field Theory on Non-Commutative Space-Times and the Persistence of Ultraviolet Divergences’, Nucl. Phys. **B567**(2000), 360, (hep-th/9812180).
- 7) S. Minwalla, M. Van Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, ‘Noncommutative Perturbative Dynamics’, JHEP **02**, 035. (hep-th/9912072)
- 8) See, for instance, L. Álvarez-Gaume and M. A. Vázquez-Mozo, ‘General Properties of non-commutative field theories’, hep-th/0305093, and references therein.
- 9) J. Gomis and T. Mehen, ‘Space-Time Noncommutative Field Theories And Unitarity’; Nucl. Phys. **B591**(2000), 265. (hep-th/0005129)
- 10) D. Bahns, S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen and G. Piacitelli, ‘On the unitarity problem in space/time noncommutative theories’; Phys. Lett. **B533**(2002), 178.(hep-th/0201222)
- 11) C. Rim and J. H. Yee, ‘Unitarity in space-time noncommutative field theories’, hep-th/0205193.
- 12) C-S. Chu, J. Lukierski and W. J. Zakrzewski, ‘Hermitian Analyticity, IR/UV Mixing and Unitarity of Noncommutative Field Theories’, hep-th/0201144.
- 13) C. E. Carlson, C. D. Carone and N. Zobin, ‘Noncommutative Gauge Theory without Lorentz Violation’, Phys. Rev. **D66**(2002), 075001. (hep-th/0206035)
- 14) K. Morita, ‘Lorentz-Invariant Non-Commutative QED’, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108**(2002), 1099. (hep-th/0209243)
- 15) H. Kase, K. Morita, Y. Okumura, and E. Umezawa, ‘Lorentz-Invariant Non-Commutative Space-Time Based On DFR Algebra’, Prog. Theor. Phys. **109**(2003), 664. (hep-th/0212176)